

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

RAYMOND E. BLAKE, :
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 v. : Civ. Action No. 07-230-JJF
 :
 MANONCHEK C. YOUNG, MICHAEL :
 LITTLE, ANGELO JOHNSON, :
 RAPHAEL WILLIAMS, THOMAS :
 CARROLL, C.M.S., JANICE HENRY, :
 STACEY HOLLIS, NATASHA L. :
 HOLLINGSWORTH, and RONALD :
 HOLSTERMAN, :
 :
 Defendants. :

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Plaintiff Raymond E. Blake ("Plaintiff"), an inmate at the Sussex Correctional Institution ("SCI"), Georgetown, Delaware, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He appears pro se and was granted in forma pauperis status pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (D.I. 8.)

On August 1, 2007, Plaintiff's original Complaint was dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and the case was closed. (D.I. 13.) On August 6, 2007, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint, adding new Defendants and claims. (D.I. 15.) The Court screened the Amended Complaint and allowed Plaintiff to proceed with certain claims against some Defendants. (D.I. 18.)

On January 18, 2008, Plaintiff filed another Amended Complaint (hereafter ("First Amended Complaint")). (D.I. 24.)

The First Amended Complaint (D.I. 24) is not identical to the Amended Complaint (D.I. 15.) Nonetheless, it is sufficiently similar that it was stricken as basically duplicative of the Amended Complaint. (D.I. 24.) Accordingly, the case proceeds on the Amended Complaint filed on August 6, 2007 and found at Docket Item 15.

Plaintiff was ordered on April 16, 2008 to provide the Court with copies of the Amended Complaint found at D.I. 15 in order to effect service. (D.I. 26.) In the same Order, the Court noted that it had received the required USM-285 forms for Defendants. Plaintiff advises the Court that if it received the USM-285 forms, it must have received copies of the Amended Complaint, and he provides a copy of his prison trust account statement showing that he was charged for photocopying on February 27, 2008. (D.I. 27.)

The Court has reviewed each case filed by Plaintiff. None of them contain copies of the Amended Complaint filed on August 6, 2007 and found at Docket Item 15. Indeed, none of the files reflect receipt of a mailing by Plaintiff on or about February 27, 2008. The Court did receive multiple copies of the First Amended Complaint filed on January 18, 2008, found at Docket Item 24, at the same time it received the required USM-285 forms. As noted, the First Amended Complaint was stricken. It is not identical to the Amended Complaint found at Docket Item 15.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Service will proceed as outlined in the Court's October 19, 2007 Order.

2. Plaintiff shall provide the Court with copies of the Amended Complaint (D.I. 15) for service upon the remaining Defendants and the Attorney General.

3. **The Clerk of the Court is directed to provide Plaintiff with a photocopy of the Amended Complaint found at Docket Item 15.**

4. Plaintiff shall provide copies of the Amended Complaint, Docket Item 15 within **thirty days** from the date of this Order.

Failure to timely provide copies of the Amended Complaint may result in dismissal of the case

May 16, 2008
DATE

Joseph A. Fanning
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE